

(3) STATUS OF THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-11 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Huttunen in view of Kodama and Mallien, II (hereinafter Mallien).

Claims 3 and 8 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Huttunen in view of Kodama, Mallien, II and Stein.

(4) STATUS OF ANY AMENDMENT FILED SUBSEQUENT TO FINAL REJECTION:

No Amendment has been filed after the final rejection of claims 1-11 in the Office Action dated April 23, 2002.

(5) SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION:

The invention has been described in the previously filed responses and will not be repeated in this Response.

(6) ISSUES PRESENTED:

Issue 1: Are claims 1-2 and 4-5 of the subject application rendered obvious by Huttunen in view of Kodama and Mallien?

Issue 2: Are claims 6-7 and 9-10 of the subject application rendered obvious by Huttunen in view of Kodama and Mallien?

Issue 3: Is claim 11 of the subject application rendered obvious by Huttunen in view of Kodama and Mallien?

Issue 4: Does Stein, cited by the Examiner in rejecting claims 3 and 8, overcome the disclosure and suggestion deficiencies of Huttunen in view of Kodama and Mallien?

(7) GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For the purposes of this Response, the claims should be grouped together as follows:

Group I: Claims 1-5;

Group II: Claims 6-10; and

Group III: Claim 11.